

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 11, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are submitted in response thereto. Claims 1-12 and 21-26 are pending in the application. Claim amendments are submitted herein providing corrected dependencies of claims 24-26 in confirmation of the previous examiner's amendment.

The rejection of claims 1-12 and 21-26 under 35 USC 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed.

The rejection states that "the specification does not disclose a directory server where a directory is stored or a directory server coupled with the authorization server." On the contrary, the directory server is explicitly taught and described in the specification and drawings. As stated on page 1, lines 9-13, "the invention relates to the use of dynamic directory services (DDS) to dynamically store information in a directory server that can be used for authentication, application authorization, and user profiling purposes to eliminate the need for numerous authorization and access control schemes with a single standard directory based set of applications." Figure 1 shows a plurality of directory servers numbered 1 through n. The directory servers are shown being connected to authorization servers 16 via a communication network 22 (page 4, lines 19-23). The specification states that the "directory may reside on any conventional computing device such as one or more network computers or server computers." Any such server containing the directory is a directory server. Thus, the application discloses both the directory server and its connection with the authorization server in compliance with 35 USC 112.

The rejection further states that "the specification does not indicate how a directory server is used to authenticate or authorize the user data, create a shopping cart, selecting items to be purchased, or how other applications access the object on the directory server." Contrary to these assertions, the specification provides adequate teaching of each of these uses of the invention. As explained from page 6, line 26, to page 7, line 2, the authorization server 16 creates an object and stores it in the

directory (i.e., directory server 20). The object is given a name relating to the session ID and the authorization server copies information from a user profile database to the object. Page 7, lines 8-15 explain that other applications use the session ID to read user information that has been copied to the object. In the example given from page 7, line 23, to page 8, line 13, a cookie named SID is created in the user's browser and other applications access this cookie in order to locate the object associated with the user. This description is sufficiently detailed to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention to authenticate other applications. Likewise, the example given at page 8, lines 14-29, teaches the use of the object stored in the directory server for creating a shopping cart and selecting items for purchase in conformance with 35 USC 112.

In view of the foregoing, the objection in the office action to applicant's reliance on statements about "a directory on a directory server", "the directory server permits ...", and "the ability of additional applications to access the object for the computer user on the directory server" is clearly erroneous. Such concepts are well supported by the specification, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 7-10, 21, and 24 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Alegre et al is respectfully traversed. In the method and system of claims 1 and 7, an object associated with the Session ID is stored dynamically in a directory on a directory server coupled with the authorization server. The directory server permits other computer applications launched by the computer user to reference the Session ID on the user's computer. The other computer applications access the object for the computer user on the directory server to authenticate or authorize the user for the other computer applications. The ability of additional applications to authenticate or authorize directly with the directory server achieves important advantages such as reducing network overhead.

Applicant respectfully points out that Alegre et al fails to teach all the claimed limitations or their equivalents. The final rejection argues that column 5, line 48, to column 6, line 49, of Alegre et al teaches a directory server that permits other computer applications launched by the computer user to reference the session ID on the user computer. However, the disclosure in Alegre et al fails to correlate with the

claimed method or system. The rejection fails to provide an explanation of what other applications are launched in Alegre et al. In fact, Alegre et al has no teaching whatsoever of multiple applications that each requires its own separate authorization. Therefore, there is likewise no teaching of using a directory to store an object accessed by more than one application for purposes of authentication. Therefore, claims 1-4, 7-10, 21, and 24 are allowable over Alegre et al.

The rejection of claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alegre et al in view of Hartman et al is respectfully traversed. Hartman fails to correct for the deficiencies in Alegre. Therefore, claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 are allowable.

The rejection of claims 22, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alegre et al in view of Blanco et al is respectfully traversed. Blanco et al does not use LDAP or X.500 to access objects having the limitations recited in the present claims. Thus, Blanco et al fails to correct for the deficiencies in Alegre et al, and claims 22, 23, 25, and 26 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-12 and 21-26 are respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: May 3, 2005
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)